

Kansas Arts Learning Application Scoring Rubric – 60 points total

1. Quality of Program and Ability of Applicant to Accomplish Program (50 points)	
1.a. Project Narrative - 15 points	
Score	Description
0-1 point - poor	Artistic quality and educational value are unclear, disjointed, vague, unfocused, unrealistic, disconnected from participants. Narrative does not answer all questions adequately or clearly. Does not consider participants' learning goals or abilities. Community impact and/or relevance is unclear.
2-5 points - fair	Artistic quality and educational value are described but mediocre. Narrative is adequate, but content lacks innovation; description is stilted/uninspired. Learning goals do not seem fully connected or integrated into program purpose or vision. Relevance and impact is minimal, overstated or lacks connection to community and participants.
6-13 points - good	Artistic quality, educational value and community impact are clear, well thought-out and organized, innovative, engaging and relevant to participants and the community. Learning goals are integrated into the program vision.
14-15 points - exceptional	Artistic quality, educational value and community impact are extraordinary. Program is unusually interesting, engaging and innovative. Learning goals are fully integrated into the vision and agency mission.
1.b Lesson Plans - 10 points	
score	description
0-2 points - poor	Plans do not provide a clear picture of project activities and content. Planning, progression, educational approach are unclear, disorganized, confusing, unfocused. Activities are not connected to arts learning goals and/or are disconnected from participant ages and/or abilities. No reference to or use of arts education resource material.
3-5 points - fair	Plans provide a minimal picture of program activities and content. Planning, progression, educational approach are outlined, but are standard or directly copied from other source material and not tailored to project. Activities are uninspired or weakly connected to participant ages and abilities and arts learning goals. Arts education resources are listed, but are weakly connected to lessons / activities.
6-8 points - good	Plans provides a clear, solid picture of program activities and content. Planning, progression, educational approach are clearly outlined and are well organized. Activities are thoughtful, innovative and clearly consider participant age and abilities as well as arts learning goals. Arts

	educational resource materials are referenced.
9-10 points - exceptional	Plans provide a clear, solid picture of activities and program content in an attractive, accessible way. Planning, progression, educational approach are clear, and well organized, thoughtful, informative. Activities are engaging, inspired, innovative and attuned to participant age and abilities as well as arts learning goals and vision. Familiarity with and use of current educational resource materials are evident.
1.c. Schedule of Activities - 5 points	
Score	Description
0 points - poor	Insufficient, unrealistic or unclear schedule containing activities not related to project or is overly complicated and/or does not connect to project description. Activities occur in random or nonconsecutive manner.
1-2 points - fair	Schedule is outlined but is too wide in scope, unrealistic, overly complicated, unfocused or weakly connected to project description. Activities occur in a consecutive fashion.
3-4 points - good	Schedule is clear, realistic, connected to project description. Activities occur in consecutive and well planned manner.
5 points - exceptional	Schedule is clear, realistic and connected to project description. Activities occur in consecutive, well planned manner and includes follow-up with program participants or community after project concludes to determine or enhance impact.
1.d Biographies - 5 points	
score	description
0 points - poor	Insufficient, incomplete bios that do not provide a picture of program staff and/or application does not clearly include artists as teachers.
1-2 points - fair	Bios are for administrative staff only and/or are too long, unedited, or merely a resume list or give information about the teaching artists irrelevant to artistic ability, professional and/or teaching experience or they lack experience. Overall, staff includes artists, but program roles are not clear or are confusing.
3-4 points - good	Bios are clear, concise and provide information about the staff's professional experience, roles in the program and areas of expertise in teaching the arts/arts education. Overall, staff has solid professional expertise. Application includes artists with teaching experience.
5 points - exceptional	Bios are clear, concise and provide clear picture of a highly qualified, experienced, diverse program staff. Staff includes artists who are both experienced teachers and active artists.

1.e Program budget - 5 points	
score	description
0 points - poor	Project budget is insufficient, incomplete, or incorrect, with arithmetic errors.
1-2 point - fair	Project budget lacks detail, is unclear and/or unrealistic (either too small or too large for program scope and goals). Use of KAC funds, in-kind donations and partnership contributions, match and other sources of funding are generalized, seem random or unrealistic. No arithmetic errors.
3-4 points - good	Project budget is clear, realistic and somewhat detailed. More detail would be useful to clarify expenses and revenue. No arithmetic errors.
5 points - exceptional	Project budget is detailed, clear, and realistic leaving no questions about the use of funds and sources of revenue. No arithmetic errors.
1.f Evidence of Partnership Support - 5 points	
score	description
0 points - poor	No letters of support, and/or letters do not mention partnership role or contribution to project, or letters are not from community partners directly supporting the project.
1-2 points - fair	One letter of support and/or letters vaguely describe partnership roles or contribution to project.
3-4 points - good	Two letters of support from partners. Letters outline partnership role and contribution to project.
5 points - exceptional	More than two letters of support from community partners that present clear evidence of widespread community support for the project. All letters outline partnership role and contributions to project.
1.g Support materials - 5 points	
Score	Description
0 points - poor	No materials or they are disorganized, incomplete and/or application includes items not relevant to the projects or contents of the application.
1-2 point - fair	Includes poor quality and/or irrelevant brochures, catalogues, and published print articles. No photographs of participant work.
3-4 points - good	Includes good quality and relevant brochures, catalogues, published print articles, either hard or digital copies of photos and/or weblinks, as well as letters of support from participants, parents, individual community members.

5 points - exceptional	Includes brochures, catalogues, published print articles that are of high quality and specific to the program; letters of support from participants, parents and community members; and weblinks to examples of program activities. The materials strongly convey the impact or potential impact of the project.
2. Application organization and clarity (10 points)	
2.a checklist order - 4 points	
Score	Description
Ineligible	Checklist items missing
0 points	Application materials are out of checklist order.
4 points	All items in checklist order.
2.b Spelling and grammar - 3 points	
Score	Description
0 points - poor	Typos, spelling mistakes, grammatical errors throughout.
1 point - fair	Application is mostly free of typos, spelling mistakes and grammatical errors.
2 points - good	Application has only one typo, spelling mistake or grammatical error.
3 points - exceptional	Application is completely free of spelling mistakes and grammatical errors.
2.c Quality of Grantsmanship - 3 points	
Score	Description
0 points - poor	Writing is disorganized, hard to follow, wordy or rambling and/or overly long.
1 point - fair	Writing is vague and imprecise but conveys a general sense of the project.
2 points - good	Writing is clear, concise and specific and conveys the project well.
3 points - exceptional	Writing is informative, clear, organized, concise, well done, easy to read and enables the reader to visualize and understand the value of the project for the participants.